UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/449,215	11/24/1999	YASEEN SAMARA	15-IS-5290	6012

7590 06/03/2003

FOLEY & LARDNER
FIRSTAR CENTER
777 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE
MILWAUKEE, WA 532025367

EXAMINER
KIM, CHONG R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	12

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/449,215	Applicant(s) SAMARA ET AL.	
	Examiner Charles Kim	Art Unit 2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 May 2003* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,6,7,11-14,17-23 and 26-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,6,7,11-14,17-23 and 26-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *24 November 1999* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on May 12, 2003 has been entered.

Response to Amendment and Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on May 12, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue (page 10) that their claimed invention (claims 1, 14, and 23) differs from the prior art because "there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation in either of Wood or Alvarez to apply three-dimensional image rendering on a PACS workstation and then communicate the three-dimensional image rendering file back to the PACS server for storage thereon". As noted in the previous office action, Wood teaches a medical image management system in which two-dimensional medical images are stored on an image server, and are communicated to an image workstation, and 3D rendering is performed on the image workstation and is provided to the server.

The Examiner admits that Wood fails to specify that the image server is a PACS server and the image workstation is a PACS workstation. However, PACS systems (servers and

workstations) were exceedingly well known in the art, and commonly used to enable medical facilities to streamline patient information and cut the enormous costs associated with film development and courier fees. PACS systems were comprised of image servers and image workstations that included the functions of archiving and communicating medical images. As noted in the previous office action, Alvarez teaches a PACS server and PACS workstation that is used to view/transmit ultrasonic images for 3D rendering (col. 6, lines 22-29).

Applicants further argue (page 11) that "although Alvarez describes a system of PACS workstations and servers, Alvarez does not teach that 3D images could be rendered on a PACS workstation and communicated over a communication network to a PACS server". The Examiner disagrees. Alvarez explains that the 3-D volume data can be viewed by using available volume rendering algorithms (col. 1, lines 19-24), wherein the volume rendering algorithms are saved as bookmarks, and sent along with the volume data to the PACS workstation for 3D rendering (col. 5, lines 49-57). For example, Alvarez explains that his system can send either 2-D images, or 2-D images, bookmarks, and volumes, depending on the PACS's capabilities. Therefore, if Alvarez's system sends a PACS workstation the 2-D images, bookmarks, and volumes, it can be understood that the PACS workstation is capable of performing the 3D rendering (utilizing the bookmark information); since it would have been inefficient and useless to send the volume rendering information (bookmark) to the workstation if the workstation was not able to perform the 3D rendering.

In response to applicant's argument (page 12) that there is no suggestion of "desirability" to combine the references (page 12), the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed

invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation (desirability) to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Wood and Alvarez are both concerned with the management (viewing, archiving, communicating) of ultrasound images, and provide a system that includes image servers and workstations for constructing three-dimensional renderings for diagnostic purposes. Wood's server is connected to access ultrasonic images and reports, and makes them accessible to a personal computer, terminal or workstation at a remote location (Wood, col. 3, lines 20-24). Alvarez's PACS system increases flexibility by allowing older systems to access the images on the image server (Alvarez, col. 6, lines 22-29). The ordinary artisan would have been desired to combine the teachings of Wood and Alvarez in order to provide a system that can interact with a plurality of medical imaging workstations, thereby increasing the efficiency and flexibility of the diagnosis process . Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Wood and Alvarez so that the two dimensional images are stored on a PACS server, and are communicated to a PACS workstation, and 3D rendering is performed on the PACS workstation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 6-7, 11-14, 17-23, 26-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Wood (U.S. Patent No. 5,715,823), and Alvarez (U.S. Patent No. 6,370,413), further in view of Hossack et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,511,426 ("Hossack").

Referring to claim 1, Wood discloses:

a. an image server (10) having a plurality of inputs and outputs (figure 1), the inputs configured to receive image information signals and the outputs configured to provide image output signals, the image server configured to store information representative of a plurality of two dimensional image slices and the output signals representative of the stored two dimensional image slices (col. 3, lines 3-29)

b. an imaging device (12) having an output coupled to at least one of the inputs of the image server, and configured to provide an image signal (col. 2, line 62-col. 3, line 6)

c. an image workstation (100) having an input coupled to at least one of the outputs of the image server (figure 1), and configured to receive output signals from the image server representative of selected two dimensional image slices stored by the image server (col. 3, lines 20-24), the image workstation configured to construct three dimensional image renderings from the two dimensional image slices (col. 11, line 63-col. 12, line 3. Note that the "sequence of spatially discrete images" in col. 12, line 2 is interpreted to mean image slices. Furthermore, the "physician" viewing the images is interpreted as being the user who is located at the image workstation.) and the image workstation having an output coupled to the image server (figure 1, Note that the connection between the image server and image workstation is bi-directional).

Although Wood teaches that the image workstation sends a signal to the image server (col. 11, lines 56-63), he fails to explicitly state that the signal is representative of the three

dimensional rendering. However, it would have been obvious for the image workstation to send a signal representative of the three dimensional rendering to the image server, since the image server stores all relevant patient information such as ultrasound images and patient reports (col. 12, lines 64-65). Furthermore, one would be motivated to send a signal representative of the three dimensional rendering to the image server in order to allow the most appropriate specialist who is located at a another workstation access to the file for diagnosis purposes (col. 12, lines 3-5).

Wood fails to explicitly state that the image server comprises a picture archival and communications system (PACS) server, and the image workstation comprises a PACS workstation. However, PACS servers and workstations were exceedingly well known in the art. For example, Alvarez teaches a PACS server and workstation [col. 6, lines 22-29. It is noted that Alvarez's system (10) is interpreted as being analogous to a PACS server because his system "interacts" with a PACS by sending 2D images to the PACS, in order for a physician to view the image on a workstation. Furthermore, the physician viewing the image would inherently use a PACS workstation in order to view the image received by the PACS].

Wood and Alvarez are both concerned with the management (viewing, archiving, communicating) of ultrasound images, and provide a system that includes image servers and workstations for constructing three-dimensional renderings for diagnostic purposes. Wood's server is connected to access ultrasonic images and reports, and makes them accessible to a personal computer, terminal or workstation at a remote location (Wood, col. 3, lines 20-24). Alvarez's PACS system increases flexibility by allowing older systems to access the images on the image server (Alvarez, col. 6, lines 22-29). The ordinary artisan would have been motivated

to combine the teachings of Wood and Alvarez in order to provide a system that can interact with a plurality of medical imaging workstations, thereby increasing the efficiency and flexibility of the diagnosis process. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Wood and Alvarez so that the two dimensional images are stored on a PACS server, and are communicated to a PACS workstation, and 3D rendering is performed on the PACS workstation.

Wood and Alvarez both fail to teach that the image slices are in the DICOM3 format. However, the applicant's specification (page 5, lines 7-8) states that other image file formats are equally applicable. In this case, Wood teaches that the image slices are in JPEG format. Wood explains that the JPEG format was commonly used for improving the transmission time of patient images (Wood, col. 10, lines 5-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to utilize the JPEG format for the image slices, in order to transmit the patient images in a quick and efficient manner, thereby improving the diagnosis process.

Wood and Alvarez both fail to teach that the three dimensional renderings are constructed by maximum intensity pixel projection. The Examiner notes that maximum intensity pixel projection was exceedingly well known in the art. For example, Hossack teaches a PACS system for constructing three dimensional renderings by utilizing the maximum intensity pixel projection technique (col. 19, lines 46-49 and col. 41, lines 57-61). Hossack also teaches that the image slices are in the DICOM format (col. 9, lines 21-24).

Wood, Alvarez, and Hossack are all concerned with the management of ultrasound images for constructing three dimensional renderings. Hossack provides a versatile method for processing ultrasound data that reduces speckles in three dimensional images (Hossack, col. 2, lines 30-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the three dimensional renderings

of Wood and Alvarez, so that the renderings are constructed by utilizing the maximum intensity pixel projection technique as taught by Hossack, in order to improve the diagnosis process by providing the doctor with an accurate three dimensional image of the patient under examination.

Referring to claim 2, Alvarez further discloses that the PACS server stores a three dimensional rendering signal as a three dimensional rendering file (col. 5, lines 41-48. Note that the "viewing parameters" in line 41 is interpreted as being analogous to the three dimensional rendering signal, and the "bookmark" in lines 42-43 is interpreted to mean the three dimensional rendering file).

Referring to claim 3, Alvarez further discloses that the three dimensional rendering file may be selectively communicated to a physician using a PACS workstation (col. 6, lines 24-29).

Referring to claim 6, Wood further discloses that the imaging device (12) is a medical (ultrasound) imaging device (col. 2, lines 63-67).

Referring to claim 7, Alvarez further discloses that the PACS server includes a three dimensional rendering file storage (col. 5, lines 41-42 and figure 1. As noted above, the "bookmark" is interpreted to mean the three dimensional rendering file).

Referring to claim 11, Hossack further discloses that the three dimensional rendering is performed by volume rendering (col. 19, lines 46-47).

Referring to claim 12, Alvarez further discloses a three dimensional rendering by surface rendering (col. 5, lines 21-23).

Referring to claim 13, Alvarez further discloses a three dimensional rendering file (bookmark) as disclosed above, that includes the parameters needed to reconstruct the three dimensional image rendering (col. 5, lines 21-25).

Referring to claim 14 see the rejection of at least claim 1 above. Wood discloses a method of producing a rendering of a three dimensional object from a plurality of two dimensional image information files, comprising:

a. receiving by an image manager (10), a plurality of two dimensional image information files from an imaging device (12) (col. 2, line 63-col. 3, line 9)

b. storing a plurality of two dimensional image files on the image manager (col. 3, lines 3-6)

c. communicating selected two dimensional image information files to an image workstation (100) (col. 3, lines 17-24 and figure 1)

d. receiving a two dimensional image information file by the image workstation (col. 3, lines 17-24).

Although Wood teaches that a three dimensional presentation is displayed at an image workstation (col. 11, line 63-col. 12, line3), he fails to explicitly state that a three dimensional image file is constructed. However, Wood teaches that the image workstation is a computer with a monitor (col. 3, lines 30-33 and figure 1). Therefore, since it was well known for computers to construct an image file before displaying an image (presentation) on a monitor, it would have been obvious to construct a three dimensional image file during the display of the three dimensional presentation at the image workstation.

Wood fails to explicitly disclose communicating the three dimensional image information files to the image server. However, as disclosed above, it would have been obvious to communicate the three dimensional image information file to the image server, since the image server can send or receive image information from the image workstation (col. 11, lines 59-61),

and stores all relevant patient information such as ultrasound images and patient reports (col. 12, lines 64-65). Furthermore, one would be motivated to send the three dimensional image information files to the image server in order to allow the most appropriate specialist who is located at another workstation access to the file for diagnosis purposes (col. 12, lines 3-5).

Wood fails to explicitly state that the image server comprises a picture archival and communications system (PACS) server, and the image workstation comprises a PACS workstation. However, PACS servers and workstations were exceedingly well known in the art. For example, Alvarez teaches a PACS server and workstation [col. 6, lines 22-29. It is noted that Alvarez's system (10) is interpreted as being analogous to a PACS server because his system "interacts" with a PACS by sending 2D images to the PACS, in order for a physician to view the image on a workstation. Furthermore, the physician viewing the image would inherently use a PACS workstation in order to view the image received by the PACS].

Wood and Alvarez are both concerned with the management (viewing, archiving, communicating) of ultrasound images, and provide a system that includes image servers and workstations for constructing three-dimensional renderings for diagnostic purposes. Wood's server is connected to access ultrasonic images and reports, and makes them accessible to a personal computer, terminal or workstation at a remote location (Wood, col. 3, lines 20-24). Alvarez's PACS system increases flexibility by allowing older systems to access the images on the image server (Alvarez, col. 6, lines 22-29). The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Wood and Alvarez in order to provide a system that can interact with a plurality of medical imaging workstations, thereby increasing efficiency and flexibility. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Wood and Alvarez so that the

two dimensional images are stored on a PACS server, and are communicated to a PACS workstation, and 3D rendering is performed on the PACS workstation.

Referring to claim 17, see the rejection of at least claim 1 above.

Referring to claim 18, see the rejection of at least claim 6 above.

Referring to claim 19, Wood further discloses that the communicating step is carried out over an Ethernet connection (col. 11, line 17).

Referring to claim 20, see the rejection of at least claim 2 above.

Referring to claim 21, see the rejection of at least claim 3 above.

Referring to claim 22, see the rejection of at least claim 13 above.

Referring to claim 23, see the rejection of at least claim 2 above.

Referring to claim 26, see the rejection of at least claim 6 above.

Referring to claims 27 and 28, Alvarez further discloses that the imaging system can be based on MRI or CT modalities (col. 7, lines 63-65).

Referring to claim 29, Wood further discloses that the image workstation includes a display (element 108 in figure 1).

Referring to claim 30, see the rejection of at least claim 29 above.

Referring to claim 31, see the rejection of at least claim 3 above.

Referring to claim 32, see the rejection of at least claim 13 above.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles Kim whose telephone number is 703-306-4038. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 8:30am to 6:00pm and alternating Fridays 9:30am to 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amelia Au can be reached on 703-308-6604. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

ck
June 2, 2003

Jon Chang
Primary Examiner